

The Republican.

No. 17. Vol. 14.] LONDON, Friday, Nov. 3, 1826. [Price 6d.

THE NEW ORTHODOXY.

THE reader of "The Republican" has this week presented to him what I have headed *the new orthodoxy*, in the very reverend speeches of two reverend gentlemen:—The speech of the Rev. Mr. Detrosier at Manchester, and the last Sunday's discourse of the Rev. Mr. Taylor, in his chapel at Lothbury in London. It is pleasing to see this new orthodoxy making its way before that dire old orthodoxy of *divine right of kings*, *passive obedience* and *non-resistance of subjects*; to see the orthodoxy of former centuries, the heterodoxy, the sedition, the treason, even the blasphemy of this! This is pleasing; and additionally so, where the priest becomes a convert to the useful preaching of this new orthodoxy. Past offences are speedily lost sight of in politics by a people, where sincere conversion is expressed, and zealous utility for the future made apparent, as the atonement.

Of the Reverend Mr. Detrosier, we have heard nothing before the present year; but various reports have reached town of the highly useful application of his oratorical talent in the neighbourhood of Manchester.

There has been a meeting at Manchester, to petition for a repeal of the Corn Laws, reform of parliament, &c., rendered important by the manner in which it has been reported in "The Times" newspaper. The speech of the Reverend Rowland Detrosier is good, and worthy of being every where copied. The following is the report taken from "The Times."

MEETING AT MANCHESTER.

ON Thursday evening last, a numerous meeting of the working classes and others, of Manchester, was held in the Manor-Court Room, High Street, according to public advertisement, "for the purpose of considering the propriety of petitioning Parliament

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 62, Fleet-street.

for a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, for a prompt and very great reduction of the present enormous amount of taxation, and for such a reform in the Commons House of Parliament as will secure to the people a proper and constitutional controul over its members, especially as it regards the management of the public money, and prevent a recurrence of that bankruptcy and ruin which is now devastating the country, and which threatens to reduce England, our once free and happy England! to the condition of the poorest and most despotic country in Europe."

By the unanimous voice of the meeting. Mr. William Eddie was called to the Chair. He commenced by reading the advertisement calling the public meeting, after which he called upon them, if they had any amendments to propose to any of the resolutions which would be submitted to the meeting, to come forward to the hustings, but by no means to create any disturbance by calling out from various parts of the body of the meeting.

Mr. A. Clarke rose to object, that a meeting called for such a purpose should be held in a room at ten o'clock at night.

Mr. Murray submitted the first resolution to the meeting which was seconded and passed:—

1. That the present state of this country, which is now in the twelfth year of peace, is that of the most unexampled misery and ruin which it has ever fallen to the lot of any country to endure. Merchants and manufacturers are stripped of their property; the working or productive classes are without the means of employment, without food, without raiment; and pauperism, the ever fertile source of profligacy and crime, threatens to extend its baneful influence through the whole of the industrious community.

Mr. Brookes moved the second resolution, which was seconded and passed:—

2. That one immediate cause of the deplorable and heart-rending state of our country, is the cruel and unjust measure of prohibiting the importation of foreign grain, thereby depriving us of markets for our manufactured goods, at once raising the price of food, and depriving us of the means of obtaining it at almost any price, and at the same time forcing those countries which would willingly exchange their corn for our goods, to establish manufactories of their own, which threaten to exclude us altogether from the foreign market.

Mr. Jonathan Hodgkin moved the third resolution; observing, that by one class they were called upon to petition Parliament for a repeal of the Corn Laws, by another class they were told it was *sheer impudence*, passive obedience and non-resistance were their duty. They were told that Ministers had already determined upon the line of conduct they meant to pursue, and all they did would be of no avail. He here alluded to some observations

which were contained in the "Manchester Herald" of that day, on the subject of the meeting. Proceeding to the subject of the resolution, he took occasion to observe, that in the reign of Queen Anne, the amount of the taxes was fifty hundred thousand pounds, or, in other words, five millions; but now they were increased till they were upwards of eleven times that amount. Five hundred and seventy thousand pounds were collected annually, or, as it is generally expressed, £57,000,000.; of which £52,000,000. were taken in an indirect manner, somehow, as it were by *leger-demain* or *sleight of hand*, and £5,000,000. only were exacted in a direct way, the tax-gatherer coming and demanding so much money. Nothing, he said, would be more amusing than that the advocates of the present system should be put to the necessity of going and collecting, in a direct manner, the, at present, indirect taxes—that they should go to the old ladies, as they were sipping their tea, for instance, and for the three pennyworth of tea demand their threepence extra as the tax, and see what answer they would get. Pokers, tongs, shovels, kettles, pots would be the order of the day. [Laughter, and applause.] He concluded a very able and appropriate, but somewhat long speech, by reading the third resolution, which was passed:—

3. That the Corn Laws, and all other prohibited enactments, which tend to raise the price of food, are the necessary consequences of the enormous, ruinous, unjust, and unconstitutional amount of taxation which the nation is called upon to pay, to maintain a large standing army in time of peace, and to uphold a system of favouritism and corruption, in the shape of useless places, unmerited pensions, sinecures, grants, and other emoluments, that are distributed amongst a few particular and influential families, who not only give no equivalent to the state, but who, by means of various unjust and partial laws, passed by themselves, are enabled to escape those burdens which the rest of the community are compelled to bear, and by which means they are enabled to exercise a control over the members returned to serve in the Commons House of Parliament, a control totally incompatible with the spirit of the British constitution, destructive of the rights of the people, and ruinous to the best interests of the nation.

The Reverend Rowland Detrosier, a dissenting minister, next presented himself to the meeting, for the purpose of moving the fourth resolution, previous to reading which he thus addressed the Chairman and the meeting:—

"Mr. Chairman and fellow townsmen, whatever be the nature of the Government of a country, when it sets aside the end for which Governments ought to be instituted; namely, the happiness of the governed, and seeks to establish an interest of its own, distinct and separate from that of the people, it ceases to be worthy of their support, and loses all title to their confidence.

This, Sirs, appears to me hitherto to have been the case in this unhappy country. Forgetful of the end for which it was constituted, the Government has sought rather to protect the members of its own community, by enacting criminally unjust and oppressive laws; and has endeavoured to secure to itself an indemnity by manufacturing useless offices, by creating criminally needless sinecures, and by imposing protecting duties in favour of that class of society of which nine-tenths of its own members are mediately or immediately constituted—namely, the landed interest. Thus have they seized upon every means of securing the interests of themselves and their friends, who are elevated into a distinct and privileged class, to the great injury of the commercial part of the community. Aware of the power which superstition exerts over the minds of the ignorant, and secure of the connivance of the interested, it has fostered amongst its multifarious pillars of state, that hydra of corruption, a church established by law, and permits to it the guarantee of an income greater than the incomes of all the religions in the world put together. Thus, through the medium of its places, pensions and sinecures, legislative, civil, and clerical, it has secured to itself an influence in the community of so overwhelming a nature, that it is dangerous to the interests of a private individual to express an opinion contrary to the established order of things. It is to this corrupt and unconstitutional state of her government, that England owes her present distresses, and the existing degradation of her pauperized peasantry: nor can she ever regain her wonted prosperity, until she has not only effected a change in her system of representation, and redeemed herself from oppressive taxation, but also recovered those rights which an interested and avaricious priesthood have perverted to the purposes of private emolument—namely, the original intentions of the grant of tithes. (Applause.) At a time when the country is deluged from one end to the other by the inconsistent co-existences of Christianity and unparalleled distress, when thousands upon thousands have been expended on the erection of temples to their God, whilst thousands of his creatures are famishing for want, what man can reflect, without feeling the strongest indignation, upon this shameless appropriation of public money to those purposes for which the tithes of the country were originally instituted? (Applause.) On what principles of equity and justice is the industrious farmer called upon to pay one tenth of his produce to a body of men, who have neither contributed capital, interest, nor labour, towards the improvement of his land, and who have not the justice to pay for the gathering of that which they carry away in the triumph of oppression? (Applause.) Sir, it is stated by eminent agriculturists, that the rent of a farm ought not to exceed one fifth of its produce. Taking the rental of this country at this rate, and admitting the right of the clergy of one tenth to be indisputably established, it will follow as a

consequence, that they who profess to hold in contempt and indifference the wealth of this world, pocket with the unblushing dignity of their calling, nearly one half the rental of this impoverished kingdom!—a sum which, according to the statements of some, allowing for demesne lands, &c., will amount to upwards of nine millions of money, independent of church endowments! (Shame, shame.) For what do they receive it? For the spiritual education of the people? It is an acknowledged fact, that four fifths of the population of this country are Dissenters, who not only support their own priests, but are compelled by an unjust and oppressive law, to contribute their quota in the shape of tithes towards the support of a priesthood from whom they receive not a shadow of a benefit. In addition to this, Sirs, it may not be uninteresting to add, that for the religious education of these four-fifths of this people about 20,000 individuals are said to be employed; whilst for the remaining Protestant fifth, 96,000 are said to be employed in the ministry, the maintenance of whom from the pockets of the community cost a sum which few private individuals have the means of estimating. Four of the bishoprics of this land yield to the incumbents the annual sum of 73,000*l.*, a sum adequate to the maintenance of 1,400 families in a state of comfortable existence, far superior to that to which thousands are reduced. These four bishoprics are—Canterbury, 28,000*l.*; Durham, 19,000*l.*; York, 14,000*l.*; and Winchester, 12,000*l.* Perhaps it may be urged that these princely revenues are necessary to support the glory of God and the dignity of his church. Sir, I have yet to learn that either the glory of the one or the dignity of the other can possibly stand in need of such supporters as injustice and oppression. The church of God is the universe of his creation; and his glory is best reflected from the cheerful countenance of man, arising from a happy and contented mind, and the possession of a comfortable home (great applause),—a bliss, too, too long denied to the industrious artisans of unhappy England. If it be said, that the Deity has commanded the payment of tithes to the clergy, and has thus bequeathed to them a guarantee of their incomes superior to human laws; I answer, from the same source, that he has also dictated the mode of their distribution, namely, one-tenth of this tenth as the wages of the Levites, and the remainder in trust for the fatherless, the widows, the friendless wanderer, and the poor of the land. If the Bible be held forth to the people as the only law of life, why is it not obeyed as such by the priests? (Cheers.) It is not, however, to the people only that the priests are unjust; it is an acknowledged fact, that what are called the lesser clergy perform all the drudgery of Christianity; whilst from a principle of justice peculiar to the craft, the professors of Christianity have stamped themselves with infamy, by permitting those to be worst paid who are most useful in their cause. Whilst their dignitaries are squandering thou-

sands, many of their useful curates are pining upon the paltry pittance of 80 to 100 pounds a year. (Shame!) If, however, England complain of the injustice of the system of tithes, and the oppressive expense of her church as established by law, what shall Ireland say? With a population, six-sevenths of which are Catholics, she pays tithes in numerous instances for the support of a church where no church exists, and maintains ministers who have neither the honour nor the honesty to live amongst the people they are paid to instruct. In a speech made by Mr. Hume, in 1824, on the Irish Church establishment, we find the following interesting information. Having alluded to the disturbed state of the country, he adds, "The tithe system affords a sufficient explanation of the existing state of things. In the parish of Ballyvourney, in the county of Cork, where there was no glebe or glebe-house, no residing clergyman or church, nor a single Protestant, the Catholic inhabitants were called upon to pay tithes varying from 500l. to 700l. a year. In the parish of Toma Drummond, in which there was only one Protestant family, the tithe amounted to 700l. In Aho Bollog, where there were five or six Protestant families, but no resident clergyman, the tithe demanded from the inhabitants was nine hundred pounds. In Innis Carr, which contained three or four Protestant families, the tithe was between two and three thousand pounds. In three other parishes, namely, Clonrobid, Donoughmore, and Whitechurch, in which the number of Protestant families was eight or nine, the tithe was 2,900l. Thus it appeared that the tithes, which were almost wholly paid by the Catholics, amount, in the parishes abovenamed, to more than seven thousand pounds annually; for the celebration of Divine service to eighteen or twenty Protestant families!!!" (Applause.) In the diocese of Elphin there are 91 parishes, which have been compressed into 37 benefices or livings, the incumbents of which ought to reside upon their livings. Out of these 37, 19 are resident and 18 absent. In this diocese of Elphin, one pluralist is receiving, according to published and uncontradicted statements, tithes from eight parishes, containing 19,264 Irish acres, in which there are 14 Protestant families and one church, in which church this numerous flock fatten on their own thoughts, I presume, their holy shepherd being returned absent. The primacy of this unhappy and oppressed kingdom alone, is estimated as worth more than 120,000l. Mr. Hume, in the speech before alluded to, states that "he had been informed, that three individuals, who had filled the primacy of Ireland, had died worth 800,000l. each, although they were poor when raised to their dignity." It is stated by Wakefield, that the livings in the gift of the Archbishop of Cashel are worth 35,000l. per annum. Those of the Bishop of Clonfert are not so much; of Cloyne, 50,000l.; Cork, 33,000l.; Ferns, 30,000l.; and that Killaloe has many benefices worth 1,500l.

per annum. He also states, that there are 118 wholly inappropriate parishes, and 562 inappropriate rectories, with vicarial endowments. So much for the unblushing charity of modern Christianity, as established by law, and the succouring care of its holy shepherds! I will not disgust you by a farther detail of these shameless acts of injustice, but simply state, that the present annual value of lands of the Irish Protestant church is estimated at about two millions and a half, and the annual value of her tithes at five millions and a half, making together the sum of 8,000,000l. drawn from a country, six-sevenths of whose inhabitants are acknowledgedly Catholics. If these immense sums are necessary to get *Christians* to heaven, when will the world be rich enough to secure Pagans a passage? (Great applause.) The fees of doctors in law and in physic have long been proverbial, but what shall we say of these doctors in divinity, these curers of souls, who, with no other client than the spirit of avaricious oppression, drain thousands from the pockets of the Irish public without even a shadow of a patient? The hypocrisy of religion has long taxed the highway to heaven with shameless imposts, but the Author of Nature never did! (Applause.) How faithfully these servants of the state perform their several duties, how dexterously they play their cards into each other's hands, may be judged by the clerical impositions of the day. When distress prevails, in consequence of the folly, not to give it a harsher name, of the Executive, the pulpits thunder out the anger of the Lord, and the rod of his vengeance is hung over the heads of his sinning people. That the anger of a hungry belly may not rise in opposition to this insult to common sense, the unlettered man is appeased with the consolatory information, that the poor of this world will have their good things hereafter, whilst the rich will be sent empty away! Thus are thousands fed upon the chameleon's fabled dish, *promise-crammed*, until their skins form an acquaintance with their bones, their bellies with their backs, which is neither comely to look upon, nor pleasant to experience. Primitive Christianity, in the person of her high priest, fed the houseless and the hungry with the loaves and the fishes; but where shall we look for a division of the last loaf amongst the overpaid dignitaries of modern Christianity?" Mr. R. Detrosier then concluded by reading the 4th resolution, and sat down amid loud and continued cheering.

The fourth resolution was then put, and carried with acclamation.

4. That the grievous and unprecedented evils which this country is at present suffering under are such as to demand a great and immediate reduction in every branch of the public expenditure, and also a large appropriation of the revenue of the Established Church, which is, as we believe, greater than that of the whole Christian ministry in the world.

The fifth and sixth resolutions passed without much observation. Thanks were moved to the Chairman for his able and impartial conduct, and the meeting was dissolved at about a quarter before 11 o'clock.

Before separating, petitions were ordered, by the unanimous consent of the meeting, to be framed agreeably to the resolutions, and presented to the Houses of Lords and Commons—the one by Lord King, and the other by Mr. Hume.

The following are the fifth and sixth resolutions:—

5. That, in the opinion of this meeting, no measures can be introduced calculated to afford effectual and permanent relief to the country, and to secure the happiness and independence of the people, but a thorough and radical reform of the Commons House of Parliament, such a reform as will secure to every Englishman a voice in the making of those laws by which his life and property are to be regulated. That annual parliaments, universal suffrage, and election by ballot, would give to the people of this once free and happy country, a constitutional controul over the conduct of those who may compose the legislature, and would deter them from giving their sanction to such acts as now disgrace the statute book, and the operation of which has plunged the labouring classes into the lowest depths of misery. With Parliaments thus constituted, new life and vigour would be infused throughout the country; England, now viewed by the continental despots as a giant bowed down to the earth by her embarrassments, and in a condition to be insulted, would rouse from her lethargic torpor, and through the mighty efforts of her highly talented and industrious population, aided by her immense mechanical power, she would in a short time become, indeed, "the envy of surrounding nations, and the admiration of the world."

6. That this meeting deem it their duty to call upon their Catholic fellow subjects to join them in demanding from the Legislature such a reform in the Commons House of Parliament as will secure to the labourer the fruits of his industry, to the merchant and manufacturer the fair profits arising from their trade, and to every British subject a full participation in all the privileges and advantages of British citizens.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE REPUBLICAN."

THE PROMOTER OF FREE ENQUIRY.

SIR,

Bristol, Oct. 1826.

AMONG the various sects and associations of Christendom, many individuals are benefitted; but how partial are these benefits,

when compared with the great mass of mankind? Suppose Christianity were calculated to make all men happy; how utterly impossible would it be to bring all under its influence? Millions of infants and idiots, die devoid of its influential power. Millions, in the atmosphere of its brightest regions, where no stone is left unturned to promote and propagate it, still neglect and despise it, and thousands treat it with contempt; centuries have rolled on since its votaries prophesied that it would "cover the earth even as the waters cover the sea;" and yet compared with the inhabitants of the globe, the numbers are as a drop in the ocean: and in these parts of Europe where it possesses all the power that political authority can give it, what is it but a trade, a scene of controversy, contention and dissension? Scarcely a tenth deserve the name they profess.

And is this the work of a Deity? Is this "glory to God in the highest, peace on earth and good will to men?" Is this the system of which it is triumphantly prophesied; "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?" By some, it is supported under authority, in wealth and grandeur, "overtopped by the lofty spire of archiepiscopal eminence; where sometimes to finish the resemblance, has been seen only a vane, veering to every breeze of political direction. Truly, this complicated apparatus of Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Chapters, Canons, Archdeacons, Prebendaries, Rectors, Vicars, Curates, &c., with their oaths, emoluments, titles, and subordination; from the poor stipendiary to those who rear their mitred fronts in courts and senates," is very imposing, but very unlike any thing in the master they profess to follow.

By others, it is distinguished by confession of faith and dipplings, and again by love-feasts and imbecile distinctions and missionary efforts, and by some, who discard all this as carnal, distinguishing themselves by the form of their hat and coat, and thus is this "bond of unity" supported, each sect "zealously contending for the faith once delivered to the saints!" What sums of money are expended to promote them! What legal efforts to punish all who oppose them! And what is the result? The Newgate Calendars, the licensed drunkards' retreats, the thousands of prostitutes, and their associates, and the vagrants of every large city and town prove its impotence: and the actions of all, from the dignified clergy down to the holder forth in conventicles, prove it "*Tekel, weighed in the balance and found wanting.*"

But the simple question lies here: can there be any real advantage in being deceived? The answer is obvious; the fanatic only would answer *yes*. Just as the drunkard would enjoy the pleasure of intoxication, so does the fanatic his reverie. In each case the faculty of reason is disordered, during the paroxysm. The latter of the two is the least dangerous; because the easier removed by rest and sleep. When the vapours fly off, the

senses recover their regular tone, the former awakes with the dreamer, continues its airy flight, and on some occasions has led its victim to a lunatic hospital. Reason is its only remedy; but priestcraft prohibits it. If eighteen centuries be not time enough to settle the disputes of Christians, what time is sufficient? This and the blood shed in its defence is a weighty consideration against it. The Christian priests have improved on the Jewish, they have provided a heaven for the obedient, and a hell * for the refractory; they have no tangible evidence of either—but as Moses received his divine communication upon the mount, near which the people dare not come on pain of death; so the modern priesthood receive theirs from on high; and he that calls it in question, or as Paul said, “preach any other doctrine, let him be accursed.”

This is laconic, emphatic, and Christian-like, but how comes it that this extraordinary knowledge is communicated to the few, “without money and without price,” to make the many pay for it? It is a very unpleasant thing for the few to live like gentlemen, and amuse themselves and their hearers six or eight hours a week in a pulpit, at the expense of the many. They have the “bird in hand,” and their hearers may catch the “two in the bush,” if they can, and if they should not have faith enough for it, “he that believeth not shall be damned.” In the pulpit, we are often told, that “God’s providential care extends to every living thing that breathes.” How this care applies to unoffending, diseased, and dying infants, and idiots, to say nothing of starving manufacturers, and their starving offspring, I am at a loss to imagine; but theologians have a salvo for all difficult cases, “he only wounds to cure, and does not afflict the children of men wilfully.” Is not this a libel on his character? Is it consistent with wisdom, power, and benevolence, to create imperfect creatures, and then torture them to rectify the defect? Are men that are born and die idiots any proof of such a doctrine? What proof can be adduced of improvement, or what advantage can be derived from a miserable existence spent in insanity or madness? On what rational ground can we prove that a being, who creates unoffending infants and idiots, to languish and die in this world, would treat them any better in another? In reply to this, we shall,

* NOTE BY EDITOR. The Editor of a paper that struggles for life has got up a fine picture of hell, into which, he, as the Devil, is thrusting two persons, evidently meant to represent the Reverend Robert Taylor and myself. If it be an insult, I despise it. If a joke, I share it. But it proves to me, who know something about newspapers, that this paper and its editor is also sinking into hell, and this is a desperate effort to save himself by trying to please the fanatics. Here is a note for him taken from the last week’s Republican. “The man who has an idea of hell is a despicable being: but he who talks about it is an idiot.” To which I now add, that he who paints it for the purpose of newspaper politics is a disgrace to this day of free discussion. R. C.

we may be told—"his ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as ours."

Then, how comes it that theologians arrive at the knowledge of them? If we have not ideas to comprehend him, it is full proof, we are not in a capacity to think of him, that we are intermeddling with what is above our reach, when we soar beyond the precincts of nature. Theologians will tell us they are inspired to know; when they give us tangible proof of this, we will believe it: until that is done, we will not entertain such unworthy notions of him whom they call "our Father," that he so partially dispenses his favours to a few of his children, "without money and without price," to live a life of ease and pleasure at the expence of the many.

Independent of gospel evidence, they eloquently dwell on the beauty and regular order of the planetary system, as a corroborating proof of the existence of the great Being, whom they say is the maker, supporter and director of it. "Impressed with the awful grandeur, order, and beauty of this magnificent scene, is it possible to doubt the existence of the great Being that created, governs and rules it?" All this sounds very imposing to those who have never had a doubt on the subject, but they either unintentionally or willingly forget, that the difficulty is increased by the introduction of this great Being, for if a great universe could not exist without a great Being to create it, and the cause is admitted to be greater than the effect, we shall be under the necessity, on the same principle of reasoning, to invent another greater cause, to create this great Being!

Is it not more rational, more simple, more consistent with known facts, to imagine that the universe has ever existed in ceaseless and uniform motion, than to suppose it had a beginning, and was created by a self-existent being? The utmost stretch of imagination can form no idea of such a being, and it is evident, from the foregoing statement, that it proves too much for the advocates of Deity; but this is not all, it not only requires the aid of a greater Being to create the lesser, but its abettors have to defend a non-entity. They have no tangible evidence of any such being, it is mere assumption; while the defenders of a self-existent universe have undeniable proof of the existence of the universe without fear of contradiction.

I admit, it does not amount to full proof, but on the scale of probability, the latter is much more consistent and less liable to objections. Our difficulty in this proceeds from our limited faculties, owing to our constant engagements with things that have both beginning and ending, not excepting our very existence. Hence we are unable to form an adequate conception of that which had no beginning; but, on closer attention to the subject, we shall perceive that our difficulties are considerably diminished by the scheme of the eternity of the universe, far more so, than

by that of creation. What idea can we form of a Being creating worlds and systems by nothing? On this principle, we must suppose there was a time when nothing existed but God, and theology admits and asserts that he is "all and in all," and there cannot be more than all. What is this but saying God is the universe, or the universe is God? How this applies to his infernal majesty, who is a formidable personage in the Christian code, I leave to Christian priests to define. It is not my province to enter on such an abstruse subject.

It has been objected, by some divine, that God created all things from nothing. In the Mosaic account of the creation it is said, "the earth was without form and void," and that creation implies giving it form* and motion. To this I answer, that such a notion completely overthrows the maxim, that God is the creator of all things: for, on that principle, he could not have been the creator of matter; (by matter, I mean every substance in the universe) consequently those Christians who deny that God made all things from nothing, deny the New Testament declaration, "without him was not any thing made that was made:" and it is an undeniable inference, that, if God did not make all things from nothing, there must have been something prior, or at least coeval with his existence.

N. B. I have enclosed £1 for those now in prison, who suffer because they cannot believe there is a Supreme Being that feeds and supports the abettors of fraud.

Yours obediently,

E. R. D.

* A lecture was lately delivered to the "Society of Enquirers" by a gentleman, who is a well known artist, on the benefits of science, which gave great offence to a few fanatics who were members. I will quote the following, "with regard to the word *form*, it is quite certain, that whatever is material must have form—form is an essential condition of being; therefore, the expression in the first chapter of Genesis, which says, 'that in the beginning the earth was without form and void,' although poetically beautiful and unexceptionable in *common* language is not more true *philosophically* than saying, the 'sun rises,' or the 'sun sets,' terms expressive of phenomena, which every one knows are contrary to the real physical facts."

WAT TYLER.

I HAVE just re-published this excellent little drama, this best of all the Poet Laureate's works, this sublime Ode to Majesty, by ROBERT SOUTHEY, at the price of Threepence. I am so grateful to the Laureate, and his Patrons, as to remember, that, the former extensive sale of this little work decided the success of my attempt to become a Bookseller.—R. C.

EPITOME OF AN ANATOMICAL, PHYSIOLOGICAL,
AND NOOLOGICAL LECTURE,

*Delivered to a select Class, being the concluding or winding-up Lecture.
Taken from Notes and Recollections of one of the Audience.*

GENTLEMEN,

I AM now come to that most difficult part of my course, namely, that wherein I must tell you something of the nature of *life*, that is, of the living principle of the animal machine. You know, Gentlemen, I have had occasion to state before, and I here repeat it, that the result of all anatomical and physiological researches into the structure and functions of the human body, have tended to establish it as certain, that vitality was something perfectly distinct from organization. I know there are persons in this town, who would have you to believe, and who *say* that they believe, that life and mind are only properties of the organs of the brain and nervous system; and that merely because these Noodles always find that organization, life, and mind, united together; and because they can *see* and *feel* an organization, and have not been in the habit of doing much more than seeing and feeling—so they hastily conclude that three things are one: instead of *reasoning* on the various proofs, aye, positive proofs, which physiology affords of the distinctness of these three principles. You will say, “What is life?” Why now I answer, How do I move my arm or my leg? There is nothing in my organization capable of generating motion. But you will say, “There is a source of motion in the body, perhaps it may be in the brain.” Well, then, I say, that this principle of motion is what I call vitality; and it is something added to, though perfectly distinct from, organization. In order the more clearly to *demonstrate* to your minds what is in my mind on this subject, I must be a little more prolix, and must detain you while I describe the component parts of the animal system. You know, then, that the body of a man is composed, like the rest of the material universe, of a substance called *matter*; but this matter has, in the case of animal and human bodies, a peculiar organic arrangement. And this organic arrangement is called the animal system; and why, I ask, is it called *animal* system, why? Why because forsooth it is formed, nourished, and acted upon in all its various functions by a principle of vitality, a principle indeed of a much higher order than any chemical principles, and one which can overpower and resist the ordinary chemical laws to which matter is subject. For we find, that the moment vital principle goes out of the body, that moment begins chemical action, and putrefaction then, and not till then, operates to the ultimate destruction of the animal

machine. I may illustrate the controul which vitality exercises over chemical action during the life of any part, by reminding you of what happens when a man dies sometimes—*why, by God, then, his stomach is digested by its own gastric juice!!!*—Now, hang me if any body shall make me believe, after I know this, that vitality is only a property of animal organization, and not something else added to it. The vital principle, then, during life, that is to say, while that principle remains united to the organic structure, produces all the functions of the body, and is sufficient, as far as we know, for all those functions which go on unattended with consciousness; that is to say, vitality builds up the structure of the body, developes it, matures it, and when it fails to uphold it, the body dies. Anatomists have imagined that there was a *vital fluid*, others have called it a *nervous fluid*, and so on, with many other names. Now, I do not care what name they call it by, nor need you bother your brains about that: all I contend for, and all that it is necessary for you to believe is, that it is a distinct principle.* And I call it life. But life, you know, does not account for intelligence. *Living organs do not think.* Oh no! those who vainly imagine that organs think and reason, it were better for themselves and for the world if they had nothing but organs to think and to reason with!! But Materialists are not deep thinkers. *I say, that as life is something added to organization, so mind, or the principle of intelligence, is something superadded to vitality.* I am persuaded, that no argument, which I might listen to, could for a moment make me think otherwise, even if the holding of so damnable an opinion were made to appear ever so desirable to me. And this is what you must and will all of you think, if you reflect carefully on what I have said, and on what passes in your own minds.

Besides, how could I have a *personal identity*, if I had not an *identical* principle, a something within me, which neither made any part of my body, nor was dependent on my life for its existence. Gentlemen, it is the mind; and however trivial these distinctions may seem, they entail the most momentous consequences, according as they are rightly understood and believed, or wilfully misrepresented and disbelieved. Matter, vitality, and intelligence, then, though closely united, are things distinct from each other. Their co-existence is necessary to the production of sensation.

I do not pretend that the mind *perceives* otherwise than by means of living organs; but this does not make the organs to be the things which perceive. The eye, for example, is said to be a complete *camera obscura*, yet let it be ever so complete as an optical instrument, and let the picture of objects be ever so clearly painted on the retina, yet there must, if I may so say, be another sentient eye behind to see it. Now, I say, that the sentient thing

* What is a principle?

behind is the mind. Mental diseases afford an illustration of the dependence of the mind on the body, just as a fiddler cannot play a tune on a violin if the strings be out of order. But you would surely not identify the fiddler with his instrument, though the latter is his only means of manifesting his talent for music.

You have heard of the doctrine of Messrs. Gall and Spurzheim concerning the brain: they say that the brain is an assemblage of organs, each being the organ of a particular faculty. This may or may not be strictly true. I have paid some attention to the system of late, with a view of examining how it stood related to the important doctrine of life which I have just unfolded to you, and which you know was the doctrine of Mr. Hunter, of whose great and invaluable merits I have so often spoken. Now, I do verily believe, that the doctrine of Gall and Spurzheim is true, inasmuch as it relates to organs of particular propensities and qualities of the mind, and it rather confirms than impeaches the truth of the doctrine of life: for these various organs are only the instruments of the one undivided, distinct, and sentient mind. What I say of body, life, and mind, is not new. Men have thought the same thing in all ages, and have expressed it in different words: we, in modern physiological language, may say, that as the vital principle organizes matter, and makes the body in general—so the intelligent principle may influence the development and modify the form of the organs of the brain in particular, the original variety being in the mind. I say mankind have always believed something of this sort. Scepticism as to the distinct nature of mind, is a modern doctrine, or rather, defect of reasoning, and a pernicious one it is too. What mankind have always believed from the remotest antiquity, and what common sense dictates, is that which modern physiology teaches and confirms, namely, that there are in man three distinct principles—a body, made of common, inert matter—a vitality added to the body—and to vitality a percipient intelligence superadded: all closely united, and yet all distinct from each other. Now, this doctrine becomes the more important when we view it in relation to another momentous doctrine to which it conduces. If mind be some principle distinct from living organs, why it may go on existing when living organs are no more; and this again in every age and in every country has been the firm and unimpeachable doctrine of mankind. Not but that examples occur of persons who think differently. There are, as I have had occasion to say before, persons who would try to make you believe, that life and mind were merely properties of organization; persons, too, who, from their talents and acquirements, have obtained a certain sway over opinion. These men have, in my opinion, done much mischief in spreading such odious opinions, than which nothing can tend more to degrade men in their own estimation, and disqualify them for becoming good and useful members of society. There are two ways of accounting for the folly and simplicity of propa-

gating such opinions. The propagators of them may either seek for an apology for their own immoral conduct in that doctrine which denies there being any moral responsibility for our actions; or they may be desirous, by corrupting the source of virtue in other persons, to bring down others to their own level in the scale of moral beings. But I will not detain you any longer on this subject. Of the great advantage of the Christian's hope in the moral responsibility for actions, and the immortality of the soul, I trust you are all well aware; and as we are absolutely certain of nothing, and as men who think generally make their own minds, so I would choose that doctrine for my own which conduces to all sorts of great and good actions, rather than one which has the contrary tendency, I am aware of the difficulties attending the proof of immortality; but you know that dreams and phantasms shew that the perception of ideas may be excited by other causes than external objects, and thus the Deity may immediately influence men's minds, so as to convey knowledge. In some such way as this, important truths may have originally been conveyed.

Of the manner, too, of post-existence, I need say nothing, for I know very well that we know not how the mind will exist hereafter. All we perceive is that nothing is destroyed, but only changes, and that the intelligent principle, therefore, is in all other things indestructible. We see, that right ways of thinking conduce to right actions, and these together may discipline and form the mind, nay, it may be that particular thoughts and actions may generate in the mind a capacity for existing eternally in another state. Here the lecturer sunk into a strain with which one should not fill up the pages of "The Republican." Suffice it to say that applause followed the close of the lecture, and that some ninety or a hundred Tyros went away fully persuaded that they had, in paying for their course of anatomical lectures, got a very satisfactory demonstration of the existence of the human soul into the bargain.

As the recollections of the above lecture have suggested the enquiry WHAT IS MAN, I shall endeavour hereafter to illustrate this question as a counterpart to your question WHAT IS GOD? And I will trace man in his capacity of body, life, and soul, from our first knowledge of him as a *moving speck in the ovarium* of his mother, through all the stages of *fœtus in utero*, *partus*, *baby*, *school-boy*, *philosopher*, *miser*, and *superannuated second child*. I will view him in all stages and sorts of vice, misery, and loathsome filth; of suffering, and of pleasure; of defect and perfection, and we shall then see how far the nature of man as we actually find it in the aggregate, seems destined to fit a separate mind for a state of immortal existence when the body is no more.

Yours,

QUESTOR.

“ON THE DUTIES WHICH A MAN OWES TO HIS
COUNTRY.”

FOURTEENTH DISCOURSE,

*Delivered before the SOCIETY of UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE,
in their Chapel, Lothbury, on Sunday, the 29th of October,
1826—By the REV. ROBERT TAYLOR, A. B. and M. R. C. S.
Chaplain of the Society, and Orator of the Christian Evi-
dence Society.*

MEN AND BRETHREN,

WHEN a man shall have discharged (as every wise and good man will) the various duties which he owes to himself, to his enemies, to his friends, to strangers, and to the immediate circle of his domestic relations; when he shall have strengthened his mind, (as every wise and good man will constantly endeavour to strengthen his mind,) by the best and utmost possible cultivation of his intellectual faculties; when he shall have possessed his good and noble heart with the excellent virtues of fortitude and justice—he shall perceive himself standing in a relation to other men, of less endearing interest than that of the immediate ties of consanguinity, but of more imperative obligations. This is his relationship to his country, and from this arises, in most natural sequence, the subject which I am now to bring before you, that is, *The duties which a man owes to his country.*

In the treatment of this subject (as we have treated every subject of moral investigation, on principles of absolute certainty and demonstration, and never shall we recognise or respect any other principle of morals) it may become incumbent on us to use a language startling to the ear, and alien to the apprehension of persons, who, now for the first time, visit our Areopagus. Such persons, not understanding the principles on which our science has been thus far substantiated, must necessarily find themselves considerably thrown out in the pursuit, upon finding *that* science now in an attitude of advance beyond the range of their speculations, speaking a language which they never heard, and establishing theorems which they had never contemplated.

In the celebration of the sacred mysteries of the Eleusinian Ceres, upon the annunciation of their *Arcana Interiora*, or more secret and more sacred ceremonies, the hierophant was wont to proclaim, *Abeste, abeste, O procul, abeste profani*—Be far, far hence, O ye profane.

Without that incourtesy, but with that justice, upon entering on this scientific examination of the moral duties, comprehended in the word PATRIOTISM, we claim a right to admonish our auditors, that if they are here in expectation of hearing the ten thou-

sandth repetition of what they have heard before, and may hear any where else, if they anticipate the conciliation of their prejudices, the least degree of respect for their religion, or any attempt to tie down the eagle flight of still expansive thought, to the dull log of consecrated stupidity—they are going now to be most grievously disappointed. There are nurseries for infants, there are schools for boys and girls, there are churches and chapels for very good sort of people—this is the place for MEN! Go there, and be for ever innocent of strange doctrines or of new ideas; go there, and be sure that no fresh-suggested thought, or words unheard before, shall disturb the sacred stagnation of that everlasting *all right, just as you were, and just as Adam and Eve used to be*, which makes up the sum total of all the knowledge necessary to go to Heaven with; and prevents what the most immoral and vicious men in society are always most conscientiously afraid of; prevents too much thinking; prevents, you know, “*corrupting the morals of the rising generation.*” This admonition is most necessary upon entering on the inculcation of a branch of moral virtue, for which, by some sort of a happy or accidental oversight, no form of religion that hath ever been in the world (and I suppose there have been religions enow) hath ever laid down any rules whatever. The virtue of patriotism is entirely unknown to theology. The examples consecrated by religion, have ever been those of tyrants or of traitors, that is, of the possessors of arbitrary power, or of the aspirants to it; its precepts have consecrated the existence of a measureless and irresponsible authority in governors, and required an abject, passive, and unconditional obedience from subjects: the character of a patriot, of one either wisely and virtuously directing for the public good, or wisely and virtuously conforming to directions for the public good, has been entirely unknown.

It shall be no offence, then, I trust, that we attempt not to establish or infer the proprieties and fitnesses of sentiment and action which become a man in relation to the community of which he is a member, from systems of theology which never professed to respect those fitnesses and proprieties, but which, in their most essential character, have been calculated and intended to prevent the mind's perceiving them or ever coming to be influenced by them. The language of theology hath never conveyed the just and noble sentiment of a genuine patriotism, breathing its ardent wishes for a nation's happiness, and pledging the immolation of self and of all selfish interests on the altar of Freedom. It hath never been said, “Come, the commonwealth, of equal rights between man and man; come, the republic, in which nothing shall gain ascendancy but ascendant virtue:” but its eternal heraldry hath been, “kingdom come,” and “come the king,” not in the investiture of a grateful people's choice; the king not to be obeyed for the State's welfare, and no longer, and no farther than the welfare of the State makes that obedience virtue, but for no other

reason than the argument of physical force. "Fear the Lord, and the King, the Thunderer, and the Thunderer's Vicegerent," hath ever been its language, that thus the blood-stained banner of the Church might staff itself upon the sceptre of the tyrant. Thus

" Superstition lent the tyrant aid,
And Gods of conquerors, slaves of subjects made."—POPE.

Under the prevalence of such systems, the problem of political absurdities is solved; and the mind unconsciously concedes the desolation of all sentiments of patriotism and public virtue among ourselves, by turning immediately, on the suggestion of such an idea as that of the love of our country, to the best examples to be found of it in the Philopœmens, Aristides, and Leonidas of ancient Greece—in the Camilli, Fabricii, Tully, and Brutus, of Rome.

We have, indeed, enow of men to talk of serving their king and country, and to sell themselves to serve in the wars; and of unprincipled demagogues, clamorous and loud in insolence against their superiors, to fill our world with noisy broils and windy boasts: but the calm advocate of a people's rights, the fearless but yet offenceless devotee of fortune, of ease, and of life itself to his country's service, is to be found too often rather in the infinitely suspicious legend on some superb piece of plate on the rich man's sideboard, than in the unequivocal evidence of an impression on the poor man's heart. Yet it is certain, that in the virtue of a genuine patriotism, even in the most trying and awful sacrifices that patriotism was ever called on to perform, there is a scope for the display of moral excellence, and a field for greatness of soul, in which the asserter of his country's freedom shines forth the admiration of the universe, the undisputed paragon of nature! The poet of imagination, in his fervid apostrophe of the most tremendous deed of patriotism which the world ever saw, hardly outruns the admission of eternal justice as to the glory of that deed—

" Look abroad through Nature to the range
Of planets, suns, and adamantine spheres,
Wheeling unshaken through the void immense,
And say, O Man, does this capacious scene,
With half that kindling majesty dilate
Thy large conceptions, as when Brutus rose,
Refulgent from the stroke of Cæsar's fate,
Amid the crowd of patriots, and his arm
Aloft extending, like Almighty Jove,
When Guilt brings down his thunder,
Call'd aloud on Tully's name, and shook his crimson steel,
And bade the Father of his country, Hail!
For lo! the tyrant, prostrate in the dust,
And Rome again is free!"

AKENSIDE.

To the discharge of a duty so tremendously and awfully just, no situations of probable life can ever call the patriot of a country free, and possessed of every guarantee for the continuance of

that freedom, as our own. The fitness and propriety of the sentiment which authorized that deed, and has consecrated its commendation, in the judgment of noble-minded men, to the days of remotest generations, is more, even much more, than there is any necessity of our undertaking to prove—in order to ensure the mind's conviction of the fitness and propriety of that milder and more philosophical love of our country, which will neither suggest nor sanction the meditation of any act of violence which may call the patriot to resist, but will never lead him to commit outrages.

The propriety of loving our country more than any other country, is but an extension of the just feeling and natural sentiment which leads us to love our own immediate relations and the family of which we are members, either as parents or children, more than any other family. And to this extent, maintaining ever the condition, that no sort of wrong, neglect, or indifference to the prosperity and welfare of other nations, either direct or consequential, be involved—the partiality and preference for our own is provided for by Nature, approved by Reason, and enjoined by Justice.

It is provided for by Nature, that is, by the implanted force of a sort of natural suggestion, as almost all essential fitnesses and proprieties of moral sentiment are—in that strong and unconquerable attachment to the scenes of our earliest associations, which winds itself about the heart without asking its leave of our philosophy; and seems to be made up of a sort of economy of the affections, by which a great many little and indistinctive tenderesses and agreeable remembrances, putting together their accumulated impression, should make up one grand and commanding passion, which is felt wherever mankind exist, from Zembla to the Line, from the cold regions of the frozen north to Numidia's burning sands.

It is a partiality approved by Reason, in that the good-will and community of interest and sympathy, which a man owes, by the law and charter of his existence, to all other men, can by no possibility be paid to all other men; and would so die away and be lost in an inane and useless conceit of the imagination, if it were not to be realized and brought into effective liquidation by being paid to those who come within the sphere of each man's particular associations, and are therefore to him the representatives of all other men, whom if he loves and serves not, he must necessarily fail of the great and only end for which the Almighty made him a man, which is, to love and serve mankind.

Attachment to our country is a partiality enjoined by Justice, in the strict fitness of the reciprocation of benefits, and the eternal and everlasting propriety which demands that all reasonable expectations should be reasonably realized. Those therefore with whom we immediately live and act, who concur with us in support of the commonwealth, have a reasonable expectation upon us of a return of a preference and consideration of their interests above

those of foreigners—foreigners in a like manner having the same reasonable expectation of experiencing a like preference from their own countrymen, and generally having the good sense to shew it, by which the scales of Justice are held equally between all parties, and wrong is done to none.

And the same eternal and immutable principles of justice in the case of any citizen or number of citizens of a State wilfully and pertinaciously withholding that degree of partiality and preference to which their countrymen were entitled, by choosing to expend in foreign lands the wealth which had been originated and created in their own—the injured State would acquire thereby a just right to seize and to reclaim to itself and to its own uses, all the property they had left at home, with so little good will to their country, as only because they could not take it with them.* As all property is created by the State, and naturally exists only for its uses, and dead men have no property at all—so men who of their own most unnatural and suicidal misanthropy render themselves virtually dead to their country's great interests, and worse than dead by continuing to absorb her means without continuing to subserve her ends; hold the estates which they call theirs by stealth, and not by right, their right ceased when their sense of the correlative obligations attached to that right had ceased; the state of stealth and fraudulent occupation commenced when they became insensible to the covenant of humanity, and indifferent to their country's claims upon them.

The same analogy of demonstration convicts the moral error of sentiment which would shelter the entire absence of all patriotic feeling in a pretended indifference to politics. A man indeed has a sort of a right to be indifferent to politics; but supposing him to enjoy a competent share of leisure and means for the study of them, his right to be indifferent to the interests of his country is of no other sort, than his right to *die*, which he who would live so stupidly, so selfishly, and so wickedly, had perhaps better do.

All good and virtuous Governors, and such at this time it is England's pride to boast of, would have every man in the empire a politician; would have their measures freely and publicly canvassed; and in the noble consciousness of their unsullied integrity, they invite and court the scrutiny of an inquiring and intelligent people.

They only who have guilty secrets to conceal, and who are conscious that the reckoning would run most horribly against themselves, on any calling to account, discourage political inquiry; and recommend as the highest virtue, that stupid submis-

* This, at any rate, is a moral that would make a man a prisoner in, or to, his country, and is founded upon an imperfect view of human welfare. If I travel into other countries, for instruction, profit, or pleasure, my expenditure is but exchanged in the visit of a foreigner to my country. Human welfare centres in such an exchange of knowledge and profits.

sion and passive obedience which gives the oppressor safety: faith in politics, as well as faith in religion, being the only guarantee for the everlasting continuance of a trade on which the market would close for ever, should the people by any sad accident leave off saying their prayers, and learn arithmetic instead, enough to find out the difference between the worth of a barber's block with a big wig upon it, and what they have been paying for it all the while.

No sentiment can be just or innocent in the bosom of an individual, which we should see at once to be unjust and criminal upon its becoming an universal sentiment. If it were compatible with the character of an honest man to be indifferent to the measures of the public servants, it would be honesty in every body; and what would be the consequence, but that no man inquiring, no man accusing, no man taxing them who tax every body, there would be a dead end of righteousness from among men, and insulted millions should lay their necks in the mire for Kings and Priests to tread on.

So in Rome's evil day, her tyrant Sylla calmly put to death 7,000 Roman citizens, assembled together in the public theatre; and no man ventured a murmur against the Royal clemency: but I have read, that when the virtuous Cato, who was then a child, was shewn by his tutor the marks of slaughter in the tyrant's palace, he exclaimed, "Lend me a dagger, and I'll staunch this bleeding!" Alas! it was not so; and his most gracious and religious Majesty returned a few days afterwards to visit his loving subjects and cut the throats of 4,000 more of them! Who were the murderers—who the criminal party in this tyranny? Eternal Justice has past her sentence—Sylla NOT GUILTY! He robbed them first—he slew them afterwards—but they let him do it!

"Hear this, ye Senators! hear this truth sublime!
They who endure oppression, THEIR'S THE CRIME!"—DARWIN.

Having thus demonstrated the eternal fitness and propriety of the sentiment of patriotism, on evidence commensurate to the making up of an absolute certainty, that no man would have a right to live at all, who should be wholly destitute of that sentiment—our method brings us now to the consideration of the proprieties and fitnesses of civil conduct which become the sentiment of patriotism.

In the setting forth of these, there needs not an improvement on the language in which the young persons hereafter to receive instruction in the Sunday School (which is to form as soon as conveniently may be, an important branch of this our Society of Universal Benevolence) shall answer to the question—

"What duties do you owe to your native land?"

The answer being:—"I owe to my native land a participation of that partiality which is just and reasonable towards my brothers

and sisters, and which involves no wrong nor disrespect to other lands. I am bound to protect my country from all enemies abroad, and from all traitors at home; to lend my willing assistance to the administration of all just and righteous laws; to aid and honour with all my heart, and with all my power, all wise and faithful magistrates; and to be ready at all times to surrender my property and life for the destruction of tyrants and the putting down of oppression."

"Beyond, or Love's, or Friendship's sacred band,
Beyond myself I prize my native land.
On this foundation would I build my fame,
And emulate the Greek and Roman name!
Think England's peace, bought cheaply with my blood,
And die with pleasure for my country's good."

Rowe.

1. Offences against this duty of patriotism are—1st., and more criminal than all, as the cause of all others, the being idly or wilfully ignorant of what the laws of our country are, and what our obligations are in relation to those laws, in consequence of which criminal ignorance on our part, bad laws, and bad men, who are made such by the bad laws, come into domination; and that most stupid sentiment that ever disgraced the character of reason, the "*Nolumus Leges Angliæ mutari*," we are unwilling that the laws of England should be changed, hath served to perpetuate the ignorance of our Goth and Vandal ancestors, and to give to the crude legislation of men who scarcely knew their right hand from their left, the imaginary sanctity of infinite wisdom. It is by this culpable ignorance on the part of the citizens themselves that the just and benevolent spirit and intention of our glorious Constitution (and I sincerely hold it to be glorious) is defeated and rendered nugatory. For, in how many thousands who shall be summoned in this metropolis to act as jurymen, should you find a dozen who know what the duties and rights of a jurymen are, or who would not be as ready as frightened children to surrender the liberty or life itself of a fellow citizen at the saucy shaking of a lawver's curls. How many are there who know, that it is, at this day, the law of England;* and here the law is on the King's own authority; I bought it myself of the King's printer; whereby, Anno Regni Georgii Tertii Tricesimo Secundo, it became law in England, that the jury shall not be directed by the Judge; therefore, when the Court or Judge shall have directed them what verdict to find, it is competent in the jury to set the direction itself aside.

2. The next considerable offence against the duty of patriotism is our contributing by any means, direct or indirect, to the popu-

* Here the Act itself was exhibited.

larity of wicked and unprincipled demagogues, such as ever will be found, and are always then most to be feared, when they obtrude the impertinence of their harsh measures and violent counsels upon the nation's state of calamity and difficulty, when most that nation needs the calm and calculating clearness of understanding, whereby alone the causes of its calamity may be ascertained; and that benevolent and dispassionate firmness of heart, whereby alone the remedy may be applied, which justice sanctions, and which wisdom guides. The furious declaimers, and the ruffian demagogues, are ever the tyrant's janizaries, and midst the tumult of excited passions, oppression sits upon her adamant throne, and laughs to scorn the impotent war of waters borne against the rock of her firm continent; but the voice of the people is the voice of God, and when that is heard, the mightiest of the earth, the sceptered sovereign, and the crested Lord, are dust and ashes.

3. Sycophancy to men who have done nothing to serve their country is also a capital moral offence against the duty of patriotism. It pays to the thief what is due only to the honest man; in which case, the payer is as bad as a thief. Reason, therefore, suggests, and eternal justice commands, that ere we pay a compliment, as fitly as ere we pay our money, we should know whether it is due or not; and ere we doff our bonnet to nobility, we should know what nobility is made of, or what the thing in office hath done, that any other thing in that office might not have done as well: because all that is paid for so much is paid for nothing—for worse than nothing—for the maintenance only of the overbloated, gormandizing, eating and drinking aristocracy of vile and worthless men, at the hard expence, it may be, of a starving and a disregarded people. The patriot, therefore, will ever render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's—but, just exactly *that*, and nothing more!

4. The debt of gratitude to those who have loved and served their country, to those who have so lived among men, that for their existence mankind have been the better; is a debt which every benevolent heart will pay with raptures of unfeignable satisfaction; and when the virtuous Antoninus put on the unfading wreath of a grateful people's love, it was something to feel that though Nero had worn the purple and the diadem, Nero were not *THAT*!

The positive duties of patriotism will necessarily be seen to absorb all considerations of personal friendship. In that the duty of promoting the happiness of a many, rather than of a few, and consequentially (should so severe a necessity require it) the duty of sacrificing the happiness of a few, to *that* of the many, is identical with our obligation to promote any body's happiness.

In the case then of the immediate interest of a particular friend coming in direct opposition to the great interest of the common-

wealth, as when, for instance, our particular friend or immediate benefactor, should require our vote to bring him into some important place in the government, for which we are conscious that he is incompetent, or that his coming in, must keep another out who is more competent, though he may be no friend of ours, though he be our especial enemy, it would be our duty—a duty as binding on us as to pay the debt we owe, to set aside our friend and vote for our enemy; nay, to set aside ourselves and make room for the cleverer and the fitter man. This did Aristides, when he surrendered his own glory to the good of his country; and gave his voice for the promotion of his rival and personal enemy, Themistocles, in preference to himself, because his honest heart thought that Themistocles would serve his country better.

By our obligation of patriotism, we are bound to consider every officer of the State, as a servant of our country, and the supreme magistrate himself as only the supreme servant. And on our country's behalf, we are bound to summon them often and heedfully to the remembrance of their responsibility, lest, like other servants, for lack of prudent housewifery, they should become intoxicated (a mighty-taking vice with them), and rob their masters; *which* to avoid, we should do all we can to keep temptation out of their way, by never conniving at any thing which we suspect to be wrong with a view to conciliate them, and ever lending our glad and grateful co-operation to all measures, and to all persons, that are likely to operate as a check upon them. So will they feel the unspeakable satisfaction of knowing themselves to be honest, and we of knowing that we shall have done our part to make them so.

Our part as to ourselves, of the great duty of patriotism, involves the grand obligation of acting with a view to the benefit of our example upon others; and therefore implies our study of the propriety and fitness of all our public actions, or of all actions of a nature or likelihood to become public. This propriety, in every one of us, in life or death, should be paramount to all considerations whatever. There is none so humble, but there is a system of which he is the illuminating sun, and within which the bright shining of his example may light up a galaxy of virtue. But all precept loses itself in the splendour of that example which since last I saw you has illuminated the world—the dying *Talma*! who, in the article of death, abjured the wicked and degrading superstition that had enslaved his country, and avowed the name of his own, and of the world's emancipator; that name which is above every name the wisest, best, and greatest of mankind, Voltaire! “ ‘Let there be no priests!’ exclaimed this glorious man; and a few moments before his death he murmured in a faint voice, ‘Voltaire—Voltaire—as Voltaire*.’” For this, his noble death,

* EXAMINER, No. 978.

the members of this, our Society of Universal Benevolence, will complete his funeral rites this day, and, in the sacred libation of the first and fullest draught, pledge the immortal memory of *Talma!*—FAREWELL.

ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENTS.

(Continued from p. 512.)

At the time of the Revolution, a new order of things commenced. Not only was the government placed on a new foundation, but the sentiments of the nation assumed a new character. From that day, the people regarded themselves as the arbiters of their destiny. From that day, they considered the institutions of the country, civil and ecclesiastical, as made for them, and not them for the institutions. From that day, the right of thinking, and of delivering their thoughts, both respecting government, and respecting religion, they assumed as their own; and spurned the advocates of slavery, who would rob them of that invaluable possession.

This spirit was nourished by the new government; which, being assailed, by the adherents of the old, with all the arguments which the obligation of being obedient to established power, solely because established, could by zeal and ingenuity be worked into, was under the necessity of defending itself by arguments drawn from the propriety of revolting against established power, whensoever an evil or the producer of evil, and from the concomitant and inseparable propriety of the people's deciding for themselves on the goodness or badness of every institution. This was the only solid ground on which the new government could be defended against the advocates of the old. And fortunate was the necessity which put such doctrines in circulation with all the influence of government to secure their diffusion and acceptance. Hence the sober and manly writings of Locke on the subject of government, laying the will and approbation of the people as its only legitimate foundation. And with the writings of Locke, those of many other eminent authors in a similar strain.

In such a state of the public mind, and such a state of the government, the disposition of the clergy to strive for the monopoly of the religious influence was obliged to manifest itself with great caution. In such circumstances the faintest indications are as valid proofs of the disposition, as the strongest displays when the power was all in their hands.

Our time will not admit of our ransacking the subsequent history to select the best illustrations. We must set down such particulars as a general recollection can supply.

The first great incident, as respects this subject, is the Act of Toleration. It is well known how imperfect, as an instrument for securing religious liberty, the Act of Toleration was: and how much it was necessary to pare the bill down for the purpose of gaining so many of the more moderate churchmen as to afford it a chance of passing. Yet Burnett informs us that on account of the share he had in forwarding this mutilated, this imperfect, this cramped, and mis-named liberty of conscience, he lost the confidence, and incurred the hatred of the church.

The last volumes of Burnett's history, from the accession of William and Mary downwards, afford most remarkable evidence of the persecuting propensities of the English church. We recommend these volumes to the attentive perusal of our readers, as abounding with the most important information which is to be found in any part of our history. The different fortunes of the histories of their own times by Clarendon and Burnett, are a curious proof of the power which the clergy have hitherto possessed of misleading the public mind, and spreading false opinions favourable to themselves. The narrative of Burnett lets out many facts which tell against the clergy. That of Clarendon discloses none which it can conceal, and none without as thick a varnish, to hide their real complexion, as it is in his power to lay on. Burnett's is the superior production in every respect; in fidelity, in knowledge, in judgment, nay even in style. Yet admiration of Clarendon, with contempt of Burnett, was a fashion which the clergy contrived to set, and which up to this hour they have successfully maintained.

There are few men to whom this country is more indebted than to Bishop Burnett. To him, perhaps, more than to any other man, it is owing, that the church party did not overwhelm the government of William and Mary (they were very near accomplishing it); when either a return to the preceding slavery of the nation, or a civil war, would have been the inevitable consequence. Fortunately the crown had the nomination of bishops: fortunately a sufficient number of vacancies took place, to give the crown a majority in the upper house of Convocation; and fortunately Bishop Burnett was the most active, the most able, and the most eloquent man both in that house, and in the House of Peers: where, greatly by his means, the influence of the Court still maintained an ascendancy, while that of the clergy carried every thing before it, in the lower house both of Convocation and Parliament.

We shall now exhibit some specimens of the evidence which the volumes of Burnett afford.

So early as the year 1689, the very year in which the Act of Toleration passed, he says, "The clergy began now to shew an implacable hatred to the nonconformists, and seemed to wish for an occasion to renew old severities against them. But wise and good men did very much applaud the quieting the nation by the toleration. It seemed to be suitable, both to the spirit of the Christian religion, and to the interest of the nation. It was thought very unreasonable, that while we were complaining of the cruelty of the church of Rome, we should fall into such practices among ourselves; chiefly, while we were engaging in a war, in the progress of which we would need the united strength of the whole nation.

"This bill gave the king great content. He in his own opinion always thought, that conscience was God's province, and that it ought not to be imposed upon: and his experience in Holland made him look on toleration as one of the wisest measures of government. He was much troubled to see so much ill-humour spreading among the clergy, and by their means over a great part of the nation. He was so true to his principle herein, that he restrained the heat of some, who were proposing severe acts against priests."—Vol. iv. p. 21.

Take another, a similar specimen in 1698:—"All this while it was manifest, that there were two different parties among the clergy; one was firm and faithful to the present government, and served it with zeal; these did not envy the dissenters the ease that the toleration gave them; they wished for a favourable opportunity of making such alterations, in some few rites and ceremonies, as might bring into the church those who were not at too great a distance from it; and I do freely own that I was of this number. Others took the oaths, indeed, and concurred in every act of compliance with the government, but they were not only cold in serving it, but were always blaming the administration, and aggravating misfortunes: they expressed a great esteem for Jacobites, and in all elections gave their votes to those who leaned that way; at the same time, they shewed great resentments against the dissenters, and were enemies to the toleration and seemed resolved never to consent to any alteration in their favour. *The bulk of the clergy ran this way, so that the moderate party was far out numbered.* Profane minds had too great advantages from this, in reflecting severely on a body of men, that took oaths, and performed public devotions, when the rest of their lives was too public and too visible a contradiction to such oaths and prayers."—Vol. iv. p. 411.

Also in 1700:—"The toleration of all the sects among us, had made us live more quietly together of late, than could be expected

when severe laws were rigorously executed against Dissenters. No tumults or disorders had been heard of in any part of the kingdom these eleven years, since that act passed; and yet *the much greater part of the clergy* studied to blow up this fire again, which seemed to be now, as it were, covered over with ashes."—Vol. iv. p. 474.

"The clergy continued to be much divided; all moderate divines were looked upon by some hot men with an ill eye, as persons who were cold and indifferent in the matters of the church: that which flowed from a gentleness, both of temper and principle, was represented as an inclination to favour dissenters, which passed among many, for a more heinous thing than leaning to popery itself. Those men, who began now to be called the high-church party, had all along expressed a coldness, if not an opposition to the present settlement. Soon after the Revolution, some great preferments had been given among them, to try if it was possible to bring them to be hearty for the government: but it appearing, that they were soured with a leaven, that had gone too deep to be wrought out, a stop was put to the courting them any more. When they saw preferments went in another channel, they set up a complaint over England of the want of convocations, that they were not allowed to sit nor act with a free liberty, to consider of the grievances of the clergy, and of the danger the church was in. This was a new pretension, never thought of since the Reformation: some books were writ to justify it, with great acrimony of style, and a strain of insolence, that was peculiar to one Atterbury, who had indeed very good parts, great learning, and was an excellent preacher, and had many extraordinary things in him; but was both ambitious and virulent out of measure; and had a singular talent in asserting paradoxes with a great air of assurance, shewing no shame when he was detected in them, though this was done in many instances; but he let all these pass, without either confessing his errors, or pretending to justify himself: he went on still venting new falsehoods in so barefaced a manner, that he seemed to have outdone the Jesuits themselves. He thought the government had so little strength or credit, that any claim against it would be well received. He attacked the supremacy of the Crown, with relation to ecclesiastical matters, which had been hitherto maintained by all our divines with great zeal. But now the hot men of the clergy did so readily entertain his notions, that in them it appeared those who are the most earnest in the defence of certain points, when these seem to be for them, can very nimbly change their minds upon a change of circumstances."—Vol. iv. p. 478.

In 1701, he says,—The *greater part of the clergy* were in no good temper; they hated the toleration, and were heavily charged with the taxes, which made them very uneasy; and this disposed them to be soon inflamed by those, who were seeking out all

possible methods to disorder our affairs. They hoped to have engaged them against the supremacy, and reckoned, that in the feeble state to which the government was now brought, they might hope either to wrest it quite from the Crown, and then it would fall into the management of the House of Commons; or if the king should proceed against them according to the statute, and sue them in a premunire, this might unite the clergy into such an opposition to the government, as would probably throw us into great convulsions. But many aspiring men among them, had no other design but to force themselves into preferment, by the opposition they made."—Vol. v. p. 545.

In this year began the memorable contests about the bill against occasional conformity. Accordingly in this bill, which was brought into parliament by the church party, and in favour of which the clergy exerted themselves to raise the greatest ferment in the nation, it was to be enacted that, "all those who took the sacrament and test (which by the Act passed in the year 1673, was made necessary to those who held offices of trust, or were magistrates in corporations, but was only to be taken once by them) and did, after that, go to the meetings of dissenters, or any meeting for religious worship, that was not according to the Liturgy or practice of the Church of England, where five persons were present, more than the family, were disabled from holding their employments, and were to be fined in an hundred pounds, and in five pounds a day for every day, in which they continued to act in their employments, after their having been at any such meeting. They were also made incapable to hold any other employment, till after one whole year's conformity to the church, which was to be proved at the Quarter session. Upon a relapse, the penalty and the time of incapacity were doubled; no limitation of time was put in the bill, nor of the way in which the offence was to be proved. But whereas, the Act of Test only included the magistrates in corporations, all the inferior officers or freemen in corporations, who were found to have some interest in the elections, were now comprehended within this bill,"—Vol. v., p. 652.

The question was re-agitated in 1703. Bishop Burnett says, "I was desired to print what I said upon that occasion, which drew many virulent pamphlets upon me, but I answered none of them. I saw the Jacobites designed to raise such a flame among us, as might make it scarcely possible to carry on the war; those who went not so deep, yet designed to make a breach on the toleration by gaining this point: and I was resolved never to be silent, when that should be brought into debate; for I have long looked on liberty of conscience as one of the rights of human nature, antecedent to society, which no man could give up, because it was not in his own power: and our Saviour's rule, of doing as we would be done by, seemed to be a

very express decision to all men, who would lay the matter home to their own conscience, and judge as they would willingly be judged by others.

"The clergy over England, who were generally inflamed with this matter, could hardly forgive the queen and the prince the coldness that they expressed on this occasion: the lord Godolphin did so positively declare, that he thought the bill unseasonable, and that he had done all he could to hinder its being brought in, that though he voted to give the bill a second reading, that did not reconcile the party to him. They set up the Earl of Rochester as the only man to be depended on, who deserved to be the chief minister."—Vol. v. p. 719.

The following is a remarkable passage:—"With this the session of parliament was brought to a quiet conclusion, after much heat and a great deal of contention between the two Houses. The queen, as she thanked them for the supplies, so she again recommended union and moderation to them. These words, which had hitherto carried so good a sound, that all sides pretended to them, were now become so odious to violent men, that even in sermons, chiefly at Oxford, they were arraigned as importing somewhat that was unkind to the church, and that favoured the dissenters. The House of Commons had, during this session, lost much of their reputation, not only with fair and impartial judges, but even with those who were most inclined to favour them. It is true, the body of the freeholders began to be uneasy under the taxes, and to cry out for a peace; and most of the capital gentry of England, who had the most to lose, seemed to be ill-turned, and not to apprehend the dangers we were in, if we should fall under the power of France, and into the hands of the pretended Prince of Wales; or else they were so fatally blinded, as not to see that these must be the consequences of those measures, into which they were engaged.

"The universities, Oxford especially, have been very unhappily successful in corrupting the principles of those who were sent to be bred among them; so that few of them escaped the taint of it, and the generality of the clergy were not only ill-principled but ill-tempered. They exclaimed against all moderation as endangering the church, though it is visible that the church is in no sort of danger, from either the numbers or the interest that the dissenters have among us, who by reason of the toleration are now so quieted, that nothing can keep up any heat in those matters, but the folly and bad humour that the clergy are possessed with, and which they infuse into all those with whom they have credit. But at the same time, though the great and visible danger that hangs over us is from popery, which a miscarriage in the present war must let in upon us, with an inundation not to be either resisted or recovered, they seem to be blind on that side,

and to apprehend and fear nothing from that quarter."—Vol. v., p. 752-54.

The following is a slight instance, but yielding evidence which is not so.

In 1709 an act passed, "which" says the bishop "was much desired; and had been often attempted, but had been laid aside in so many former parliaments, that there was scarce any hopes left to encourage a new attempt. It was for naturalizing all foreign Protestants, upon their taking the oaths to the government, and their receiving the sacrament in any Protestant church. Those who were against the act, soon perceived that they could have no strength, if they should set themselves directly to oppose it: so they studied to limit strangers in the receiving the sacrament to the way of the church of England. . . . It was thought best to cast the door as wide open as possible for encouraging strangers. . . . But all those who appeared for this large and comprehensive way, were reproached for their coldness and indifference in the concerns of the church; and in that I had a large share; as I spoke copiously for it when it was brought up to the Lords."

Something not less instructive than this passage is the comment of Swift upon the last sentence. It consists of the word "Dog." We shall add the words which immediately follow in the same paragraph. "The bishop of Chester spoke as zealously against it, for he seemed resolved to distinguish himself as a zealot for that which was called high church."

Burnett speaking of the clerical proceedings in the same year, (1709), and the hopes begun to be founded upon the sentiments of the queen, says, "Indeed it was but too visible, that the much greater part of the clergy were in a very ill temper, and under very bad influences; enemies to the toleration, and soured against the dissenters."

(To be continued.)

Subscriptions for Messrs. Perry, Clarke, and Campion, still basely confined in Giltspur-street Compter, in the third year of an imprisonment, for having sold certain books, which are now openly sold, and for selling which, the Ministers and Fanatics have grown so wise, or have been beaten into such good manners, as not to molest the venders.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Mr. Bickley	2	6	C. B.'s half-year's interest of 25 <i>l</i> .		
Mr. Pattinson	1	3	subscription to the Joint Stock		
W. T.	4	0	Book Company	12	6
W. W.	3	6	Tristram Shandy	3	0
Mr. Russell	3	0	E. B.	0	9
C. R.	3	0	Anonymous, Quarterly	£ 3	0 0
E. R. D.	£ 1	0 0			

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 62, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican," to be left at the place of publication.